

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 1-11 are allowed. Claims 12-14 and 17 are rejected. Claims 1, 8, 12, 14 and 15 are amended. Claims 17-18 are canceled. Claims 1-16 remain.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

I. Claim Objections

It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 1, 8, 12, 14 and 17 are objected to for informalities. Applicant has canceled claim 17 and amended claims 1, 8, 12 and 14 to overcome the informal objections.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections for claims 1, 8, 12 and 14 are respectfully requested.

II. 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant has canceled claim 17, and amended claim 12 to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection for claim 12 is respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 12-14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,429,679 issued to Kim et al. ("Kim"). Applicant has canceled claim 17. Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection of claims 12-14 for the following reasons.

It is asserted in the Office Action that Kim does not teach or fairly suggest a method

where controlling adjustment of resistors for a predetermined commanded adjustment time by a control signal to start an operation for the predetermined commanded adjustment time depending on an external resistance adjust command. Applicant has amended claim 12 to include the allowable limitations. Therefore, amended claim 12 is now placed in allowable form. Additionally, since Applicant's claims 13-14 either directly or indirectly depend on amended claim 12, Applicant's claims 13-14 are allowable for the same reason.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's assertion that claims 1-11 are allowed. Applicant also notes with appreciation the Examiner's assertion that claims 15 and 16 are objected to for depending on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has amended claim 12 to include limitations of claim 15 that are asserted to be allowable over Kim.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-16, as they now stand, are allowable for the reasons given above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-16 patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: September 26, 2006

By: _____

Steven Laut, Reg. No. 47,736

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on September 26, 2006.

Jean Svoboda